

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 33237

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2008 Unpublished Opinion No. 438
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: April 24, 2008
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
JEAN G. GLENN,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Cassia County. Hon. Monte B. Carlson, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of six years, with two years determinate, for possession of a forged check, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Heather M. Carlson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Ralph R. Blount, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

PER CURIAM

While on probation for issuing an insufficient funds check, Jean G. Glenn was charged with grand theft by possession of a stolen check and the charge was later amended to possession of a forged check, I.C. § 18-3605. Glenn was found guilty by a jury and was sentenced to a unified term of six years, with two years determinate, and the district court retained jurisdiction. After Glenn completed her rider, the district court suspended her sentence and placed her on probation for three years. Glenn appeals from her judgment of conviction and sentence, contending that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence.

Where a sentence is within the statutory limits, it will not be disturbed on appeal absent an abuse of the sentencing court's discretion. *State v. Hedger*, 115 Idaho 598, 604, 768 P.2d 1331, 1337 (1989). We will not conclude on review that the sentencing court abused its discretion unless the sentence is unreasonable under the facts of the case. *State v. Brown*, 121

Idaho 385, 393, 825 P.2d 482, 490 (1992). In evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence, we consider the nature of the offense and the character of the offender, applying our well-established standards of review. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 170 P.3d 387 (2007).

Applying the foregoing standards and having reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing the sentence. Accordingly, Glenn's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.